

Sanitized Copy Approved for
Release 2009/12/03 :
CIA-RDP85T00875R00100001

Sanitized Copy Approved for
Release 2009/12/03 :
CIA-RDP85T00875R00100001

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

22 December 1960
OCI No. 6383/60

Copy No. 133

CURRENT INTELLIGENCE STAFF STUDY

MAO TSE-TUNG AND DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

(Reference Title: POLO IX-60)

INSTRUMENTAL VALUE

Do Not Destroy

THIS MATERIAL CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECT-
ING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES
WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS,
TITLE 18, USC, SECTIONS 793 AND 794, THE TRANSMIS-
SION OR REVELATION OF WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO
AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

CURRENT INTELLIGENCE STAFF STUDY

MAO TSE-TUNG AND DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

This is a working paper, the first of at least two papers on Mao Tse-tung as a Marxist philosopher. A second and much longer paper will discuss Mao and historical materialism.

Because the Chinese Communists present Mao as the world's foremost living theorist, and because this claim for Mao is an issue in the continuing Sino-Soviet dispute, it struck us as worth while to try to evaluate the claim. The claim will presumably continue to be a factor in the Sino-Soviet relationship even after Mao's death, just as the differing Soviet and Chinese assessments of Stalin's contribution have continued to be a factor.

The Sino-Soviet Studies Group would welcome comment on this paper. The paper was written by [redacted] the China Division of the Sino-Soviet Bloc Area [redacted]

STAT

SUMMARY

Mao Tse-tung's claim to have made an original contribution to the theory of dialectical materialism rests on two essays, On Practice and On Contradiction, both alleged to have been written in 1937. Even if this date were credible, Mao's positions would be almost entirely derivative.

Mao's theory of cognition is the same as Lenin's. His theory of truth, a rationale for changes in the party line, is a paraphrase of Lenin's, which itself came from Engels. His theory of the unity and struggle of opposites, similarly a rationale for emphasizing now "unity" with and now "struggle" against this or that class or group, was apparently reached by compressing some formulations of Lenin's. The much-advertised contribution of "Mao" to this theory--the distinction between antagonistic and non-antagonistic "contradictions" (conflicts)--seems really to have come from Andrei Zhdanov.

Mao does seem to have made one small contribution. This is his contention that there is a "principal aspect" of any contradiction which is the determinant of qualitative change. While this explanation is philosophically suspect, it is a novel formulation.

The evidence strongly suggests that Peiping has falsified the dates of composition of these essays, and that they were actually written in the period 1950-52. This was done in the interest of making Mao appear to have anticipated Stalin and Zhdanov in certain formulations which he in fact copied from them.

In short, the claims for Mao as a contributor to the theory of dialectical materialism are largely spurious.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MAO TSE-TUNG AS A MARXIST PHILOSOPHER

Introduction

The Chinese Communists claim that Mao Tse-tung's "ideology" is "an extremely important blossoming and creative development of Marxist-Leninist dialectical and historical materialism." It should be said at once that Chinese theorists see many more contributions to doctrine than do others, as it is their duty to do so.

At precisely what points did Mao introduce a novel idea, make a contribution to theory? This question will be discussed, first, in regard to dialectical materialism--the philosophical, "dialectical" explanation of nature and the universe.

I. DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

Mao's claim to an original contribution in the field of Marxist dialectical materialism rests on two essays: On Practice and On Contradiction. These works are said to have been written in July and August 1937, respectively. He has more recently been credited with theoretical vision as displayed in On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, a speech given on 27 February 1957 (and in another speech on 12 March 1957, although the March date is no longer used) and revised for publication by Mao in June 1957 after the fiasco of the "hundred flowers." Because this more recent work deals almost entirely with matters pertaining to historical materialism--the materialist interpretation of history--it will be discussed later.

On Practice

On Practice is, according to Li Ta, one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the chairman of the Scientific Association for Philosophy, "a development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of practice." (2) This remark was made two months after On Practice was reviewed in Pravda (18 December 1950) as a work which "develops basic concepts of Marxism-Leninism on dialectical-materialist cognition." Within months after its publication in the USSR (Bol'shevik, No. 23, December 1950) and Communist China (Jen-min Jih-pao, 29 December 1950), the Chinese Communists were making claims which went beyond the more modest view that On Practice had "summed up" existing theory and doctrinal tradition, while the Soviet theorists were soon content to rest on their oars.

In his article, Li Ta approaches the role of practice in the knowing-process by citing a passage from Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks:

From living intuition to abstract thought,
and from thence to practice--that is the
dialectical road to knowledge of the truth,
to knowledge of objective reality.

But Mao, he claims, has "developed" this principle of Lenin by drawing a penetrating distinction between two stages in the knowing-process: that is, "from perception (intuition) to thought and from thought to practice." Mao pointed out that the "perception" of the first stage is a low stage of knowledge, while the "thought" of the second stage is a high stage of knowledge.

It is difficult to grant validity to Li's claim on the grounds he chooses for it. For Lenin's above-mentioned remark clearly posits two stages in the knowing-process, and other statements made by him indicate that it was precisely with this process that he dealt. The theory of knowledge, he wrote, must study "the origin and development of cognition, the transition from non-consciousness to consciousness." /Lenin's italics and hereafter/ (3) "We must not regard our knowledge as ready made...but must determine how knowledge emerges from ignorance, how incomplete, inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact." (4) "Sensation /psychological perception/ is the transformation of the energy of external excitation into a state of consciousness /thought/" (5) But how this transition from physical to mental occurs in the concrete and exactly through what mechanism, Lenin never actually informs us, and neither does Mao.

Lenin repeatedly makes the point, which Mao merely reiterates in On Practice, that knowledge moves upward, ascends in stages. Lenin's view is that knowledge must not be regarded as a passive, "immediate" reflection of reality, but as a process in which the knowing subject takes an active part, ascending by abstraction from sensations to higher products of knowledge; that is, as a process occurring by stages. He says, "Knowledge is the reflection of Nature on the part of man. This reflection, however, is by no means a simple, immediate, total affair, but rather a process involving a series of abstractions, formulations, the framing of concepts, laws, etc." (6) "In ascending from the concrete to the abstract, thought--provided it is correct--does not get farther away from truth, but comes closer to it...all

scientific abstractions present a deeper, more faithful, more complete reflection of Nature." (7) "The movement of knowledge towards its object must always take place in a dialectical fashion..." (8) "Truth is a process. Man advances from subjective idea to objective truth by way of 'practice' (and technology)." (9) "Man is unable to grasp-reflect-copy Nature as a whole, a complete thing, in its 'immediate totality;' he can only approach eternally closer to it, by creating abstractions, concepts, laws, a scientific world-picture, and so on, and so forth." (10)

Lenin's emphasis in these passages stems from his effort to strike a contrast to the sensationalist views of materialists such as Mach. He insists, throughout the working-out of the "dialectical" transition from the sensory to the "logical" stages of knowledge, on preserving an essential distinction between the two. He thereby acknowledges the basic impossibility of assimilating intellectual cognition to sensory activity. When, therefore, Mao, discussing two stages in the process of gaining knowledge, states that, "Conception (thought) is not only quantitatively but also qualitatively different from perception (sensory activity)," (11) he is attacking the sensationalist dragons precisely from Lenin's position.

Chinese theorists also advanced claims of philosophical uniqueness for On Practice in connection with the Marxist theory of truth. Ai Ssu-chi, deputy chairman of the Scientific Associations for Philosophy, who has been writing on the methodology of thought since at least 1936 (12), states that Mao "clarifies and develops Engels' and Lenin's famous principle on absolute and relative truth." (13) Ai seems to have abstracted a statement in Pravda, 18 December 1950, which had reviewed Mao's essay. His case appears to rest primarily on the following statement of Mao's: "A Marxist recognizes that the development of the total process of the universe is absolute, whereas the development of each particular process in this total process is relative. Hence in the great river of absolute truth, man's knowledge of a particular process in each given stage of development is only relatively true. Absolute truth is compounded of a sum-total of relative-truths." (14)

Actually, this is merely a paraphrase, not a development, of Lenin's remarks in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism: "Human reason in its nature is capable of yielding and does yield the absolute truth which is composed of the sum-total of relative truths. Each step in the development of science adds new fragments of truth, and from this the absolute truth is constituted, but the limits of the truth of each scientific statement are relative." (15) And indeed, Lenin was

merely repeating Engels' argument in Anti-Duhring, where he discusses "eternal truths" and states that "the knowledge which has an unconditional claim to truth is realized in a series of relative errors."

Another argument used by Ai Ssu-chi, which on first consideration appears pertinent to the claim for Mao's uniqueness, is that Mao "proved the necessity of the uninterrupted development of true knowledge." (16) That is, that all "truths" must be connected without interruption. This is an important point, and the manner in which Ai underscores it indicates that this is the philosophical rationalization for any reversal in line by a revolutionary leader; it may be used as a club against those who are reluctant to change course ("dogmatists, die-hards"). Thus Mao says that, "A true revolutionary leader must be adept at correcting his ideas, theories, plans, or programs when they are mistaken... If the cognition of revolutionaries does not change quickly with a situation, they cannot lead the revolution towards victory." (17)

While Mao was well advised in making this practical point, his eulogists are not justified in stressing its novelty. For, among other things, Engels in Anti-Duhring states that "Truth and error, like all concepts which are expressed in polar opposites, have absolute validity only in an extremely limited field." And Lenin, more concretely, tells Gorky that, "There is nothing either sacred or holy about theories or hypotheses; they serve us only as instruments." (18) Finally, Lenin again: Above all, we "must take account of real life, of the exact facts of reality, and not hang on to the tails of the theories of yesterday, which...do not come near enough to the complexities of life." (19)

As in Mao's discussion of (a) the two stages of the knowing-process and (b) relative truth, his (c) distinction between appearance and essence, in the matter of cognition, is also part of the already-organized Marxist doctrine. Mao has nothing to add to Engels' and Lenin's ideas on appearance and essence. There is, moreover, a straight line running from Marx's critical reformulation of (d) the primacy of practice in knowledge (2), through the writings of Engels, and on into the writings of Lenin and Stalin.

In responding to the question we posed at the beginning of this paper, we must state that in On Practice, Mao at no point--(a), (b), (c), or (d)--introduces a novel idea or makes a "contribution" to Marxist dialectical materialism. Professor Feng Yu-lan, perhaps the greatest living historian

of Chinese philosophy, in an unusual review of On Practice, finds that even Mo Ti (c. 479-381 B.C.), Wang Chung (born c. 27 A.D.), and Wang Chuan-shan (1619-1692 A.D.) in effect anticipated all of Mao's views on the role of practice in the knowing-process. (21)

On Contradiction

In turning to On Contradiction (published in Peking Jen-min Jih-pao, 1 April 1952), we note that the first official Peking commentary on it directly states that Mao "develops the dialectical materialism of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin...deeply expounds every phase of the law of the unity of opposites...and in particular, he expounds the particularity of contradiction." (22) Ai Ssu-chi is also precise as he states, with his usual clarity, that On Contradiction "further develops Lenin's brilliant idea that 'Dialectic, briefly defined, is the theory of the unity of opposites'" (23) and that Mao "further defined the correct relationship between internal contradiction and external causation in the development of things." (24)

To complete this sketch of claims, we note that in the various Chinese tributes to On Contradiction, no Soviet praise is cited; this is in sharp contrast to Soviet eulogies for On Practice in 1950. At that time, Stalin apparently was anxious to prove his friendship and respect for Mao, sanctioning the publication of On Practice in Bol'shevik and Soviet praise for it. Following the initial (1950-1951) Soviet and Chinese claims that On Practice was a creative "development" of the theory of cognition, Moscow apparently decided to avoid effusive tributes to Mao, probably from concern that the Chinese leaders had started to rise to Stalin's level as a theorist in the world Communist movement. By 1952, it was clear that Stalin had no intention of further enhancing Mao's prestige, and in reviewing the first volume of the Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung (published in Peking, 12 October 1951), Soviet theorists attempted to show Mao's complete theoretical dependence on Lenin's views on national-colonial revolutions and, particularly, on Stalin's analysis of the peculiarities and developmental stages of the Chinese revolution. (25) Chinese reviewers, however, went beyond this, often assigning an independent value to Mao's revolutionary strategy. (26)

Returning to Ai Ssu-chi's claims, the second seems worthy of being discussed first, as it concerns Mao's definition of the "correct relationship between internal contradiction and external causation." In On Contradiction, Mao stresses from the start that the "contradiction within a thing is the basic cause of its development, while the interconnection of a thing with, and its interaction upon, other things

are secondary causes of its development," and then goes on to repeat this view, stating that external causes are the "condition" of change while internal causes are the "basis" of change. (27) History is invoked to instance the point: the October Revolution in Russia influenced, from the outside, changes in all countries, but such changes arose according to an "inner necessity" within those countries as well as in China.

It is not true that these statements "further define" the philosophical idea of causation, for they in no manner advance from the Marxist "necessary self-movement" of things which Hegel's Logic had fathered. Thus Hegel states in his Logic that, "...contradiction is the root of all movement and life, and it is only in so far as it contains a contradiction that anything moves....," and Lenin repeats: "development as a unity of opposites /in contradiction/...furnishes the key to the 'self-movement' of everything in existence." (28) Lenin rejects any source of motion lying outside things--that is, any Prime Mover--and Mao follows his lead by criticizing "motion by external forces" as a metaphysical concept. (29) Engels, too, had contrasted the "metaphysical mode of thought" with the dialectical materialist position, which maintains that "contradiction is precisely what motion is." (30)

The first of Ai's claims--that Mao further develops Lenin's views on the unity of opposites--can be analyzed with the precision it deserves only if we assume that there are two claims here. That is, concerning (a) unity and (b) struggle of opposites.

After listing a handful of synonyms for "unity," Mao informs us that there are two conditions of unity. "First, two aspects of every contradiction in the process of development of a thing find the presupposition of their existence each in its opposite aspect and both coexist in an entity. Second, the two contradictory aspects according to given conditions, tend to transform themselves each into its opposite aspect." (31)

Mao appears to be merely compressing three of 16 elements which Lenin describes as constituting the essence of dialectics: "...the totality of this thing's manifold interconnections with other things..."; "Everything (phenomenon, process, etc.) is bound up with every other"; and "...not only unity of opposites, but transformation of every degree, quality, feature, aspect, trait into every other (into its opposite)." (32) /Lenin's italics/ Mao's interesting gloss, that without the contradictory aspect which is opposed to it "each aspect loses the condition of its existence," is a logical deduction from Lenin's element mentioned second above.

The unity of opposites had a practical significance, of course, at the time Ai Ssu-chi discussed it in 1952 shortly after the 1 April publication of On Contradiction. He says that, although "conditional and relative"--Lenin's phrase--this unity could be observed in the "coexistence of two opposite classes in New China: the working class and the bourgeoisie, which together form part of the people's democratic united front." (33) The publication of On Contradiction had marked the beginning of a shift of the CCP to a relatively soft line on the national bourgeoisie and appears to have been part of Mao's effort to call a halt to the 5-anti's (34), inasmuch as the capitalists had been given a thorough lesson in political power. (35)

Mao seems anxious to view the unity of opposites as being not only inevitable, but also, at times, desirable. What appears to be crucial for him is that this aspect of contradiction gives a revolutionary leader carte blanche to change the line and even compromise temporarily with an "enemy" without transgressing on doctrine. (36) He is in effect attempting to make criticism of politburo policy from the party ranks virtually impossible. Thus in explaining the CCP's united front with the Kuomintang (KMT), his theoretical justification is, "Contradictory things change into one another; therein is contained a certain identify." (37)

As for struggle, Mao informs us that "The struggle within a contradiction runs throughout a process from beginning to end and causes one process to transform itself into another, and as the struggle within the contradiction is present everywhere, we say the struggle within the contradiction is unconditional, absolute." (38)

This accords precisely with Lenin's view. For Lenin, it is struggle, not unity, which is primary in a contradiction. The unity of opposites is relative, temporary, transient; but the struggle between mutually exclusive opposites is "absolute, just as development and motion are absolute." (39) In summing up, Mao demonstrates just how faithful he really is as a disciple of Lenin: "Conditional, relative unity, combined with unconditional, absolute struggle, constitutes the movement in opposites in all things." (40) In Dialectical and Historical Materialism (October 1938), Stalin, too, informs us that "struggle" constitutes the "internal content of the process of development" and that "struggle" arises on the basis of all contradictions.

A practical application of this view of contradiction to the situation in China is made by Ai, who not surprisingly says that the "relationship of working class-bourgeoisie coexistence inevitably will pass through a definite struggle."

(41) The struggle against the national bourgeoisie, however, will be waged, Ai says, "economically...legally...ideologically; that is, in the form of education and reform," inasmuch as--here he quotes Mao--"Contradictions and struggle are universal absolute, but the methods for solving contradictions, that is, the forms of struggle, differ according to differences in the nature of the contradictions." (42)

Ai goes on to discuss "Mao Tse-tung's" distinction between "antagonistic and non-antagonistic" contradictions (43) and, though insisting that this is "based on certain basic ideas of Lenin," he gives no statement of Lenin to support the distinction directly. The question arises: Is Mao here making an original contribution?

It appears that he is not, for in an effort to avoid the implication that conflict exists in a socialist society, Stalin's Lieutenant, A. A. Zhdanov, in 1947 had set forth the idea that contradictions can be antagonistic or, under socialism, non-antagonistic. (44) But Zhdanov set forth his view in 1947, whereas Mao's essay, the Chinese editors tell us, "was written...in August 1937" and was republished in April 1952. We will later on attempt to demonstrate that On Contradiction probably was not written in 1937 and that the period 1950-1952 is closer to the mark. The evidence will suggest that Mao did not anticipate Zhdanov's 1947 thesis.

To return to the first official Peiping commentary on the essay, Mao is said to have "expounded the particularity of contradiction." The "particularity of contradiction" is the idea discussed most fully not only in Ai's article, but also in that of other important theorists, including Shen Chih-yuan (45) and Li Ta (46). Mao's discussion of this idea is thus given considerable emphasis. This emphasis, it appears, results from Mao's own instruction: "the particularity of contradiction should be studied with special attention." Following his discussion of the "universality of contradiction," which is merely a thematic treatment of Engels' and Lenin's view that contradictions appear everywhere and in everything, Mao asserts that, "if we do not study the particularity of contradiction, we can in no way determine the particular quality of a thing." (47) Taken by itself, this is tautological.

But it soon emerges from Mao's discussion that he is anxious to stress, not general propositions but rather "concrete things"--"concrete things" which "our dogmatists" refuse to study. "Our dogmatists do not observe the principle"

of using different methods to solve different contradictions. (48) Mao concludes on a practical note: because of certain conditions, "an alliance of the KMT and CCP is brought about at one time, and at another time a struggle." (49)

This is crude dialectics. It is below the level of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. It resembles Stalin's clumsy thinking and style.

We can see how thus far Mao's discussion of particularity qualifies the "law" of universality, introduce ifs and buts, and in this way reduces its effectiveness as a general rule of philosophy. But at the same time, it obviously makes the "law" of universality less of a hindrance to a revolutionary leader, who must frequently change course in actual practice. As for its novelty, none seems to exist, not even in the term "particularity." The Short Philosophical Dictionary, edited by M. Rozenthal and P. F. Yudin in 1939, quotes Engels and Lenin on the matter of particularity, and Mao himself says that, Stalin analyzed the "particularity of the imperialism of tsarist Russia" and his analysis "serves us as a model." (50)

Mao Makes a Contribution to Dialectical Materialism

In his discussion of particularity, Mao makes a distinction which appears to have been made by no Communist theorist before him. Of two contradictory aspects in any contradiction, one must be the principal and the other the secondary. "The quality of a thing is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction that has won the dominant position." It follows--and this is crucial--that the "quality of a thing changes...when the principal aspect of the contradiction undergoes a change." (51)

Mao seems to have hit upon a new way to describe the law of the Negation of the Negation. It is his way of commenting on the "supercession of the old by the new." We can agree with Shen Chih-yuan's statement that "the point at which Mao Tse-tung was especially creative is in his thesis on the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of contradiction." (52)

Mao's description of qualitative change seem to be the extent of his originality as a Marxist dialectical materialist.

Chinese Falsify Dates of Publication

Every Chinese theorist who has discussed On Practice and On Contradiction explicitly or implicitly asks the reader to assume that these essays were written in 1937. This does not appear to be true.

When, on the basis of his unique description of the Negation of the Negation, Mao makes the deduction that even the predominant productive forces (base) become subordinated to elements in the superstructure, which manifest themselves in the "principal and decisive role," he denies one of Marx's most consistently held views. That is, the view that the productive forces are decisive in determining the super-structural relations of production. "Political and cultural reforms," Mao says, "become the principal and decisive factors." (53) But this is precisely a restatement of Stalin's departure from Marx's view. In Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Stalin states that "new social ideas and theories" become the "most potent force...which facilitates the progress of society."

We have posed the question: Did Mao anticipate Zhdanov's idea of non-antagonistic contradictions? We now ask: Did Mao also anticipate Stalin's revision of Marx? Stalin's Dialectical and Historical Materialism (actually a work of several scholars) was published in October 1938, but Chinese theorists claim, as we have said, that Mao's On Contradiction was written in August 1937.

We must state flatly that the Chinese claim appears to be fraudulent. There is considerable evidence for the view that neither On Practice or On Contradiction were written in 1937, but rather in the period from 1950 to 1952 and that Mao copied innovations made by Stalin and Zhdanov. These are the facts:

1. On Practice was published in Bol'shevik, No. 23, December 1950, and reviewed in Pravda, 18 December 1950. It was not until 29 December 1950 that this essay was published in the Peking Jen-min Jih-pao, and this was the first time, as far as can be determined, that it was ever published in China. The earliest available edition of Mao's selected works in the Hoover Library's extensive Chinese Collection (Stanford), dated 1945, includes essays written in the period from May 1937 to December 1944 but makes no mention of either of Mao's philosophical essays. (54) Similarly, another edition of Mao's selected works in the Hoover Library, dated March 1947, with its supplement, dated December 1947, contains no references to the philosophical essays. (55)

2. The Cheng-feng Wen-hsien (Party Reform Documents) used in the CCP's 1952-1954 "rectification" campaign--the effort to tighten up party organization by Stalinist indoctrination and the effort to adapt doctrine to conditions in China--contain no references to the essays. (56) As a matter of fact, theorists are sharply attacked in the Documents.

3. Liu Shao-chi's writings, particularly How to be a Good Communist (given as a series of lectures in Yen-an, July 1939) contain no references to Mao's 1937 essays. In How to be a Good Communist, Liu says, "We must oppose the separation of theory from practice," but fails to mention Mao's On Practice in which this admonition is stressed. He refers to M. Mitin as "a Soviet philosopher" in a passage on mastering "Marxist theory," but again does not mention Mao. He quotes Stalin on "the sources of contradiction within proletarian parties," then Engels, "contradictions must be solved by means of struggle," and Stalin again on "the overcoming of contradictions within the party by means of struggle," but Mao is not mentioned. Thus two of Mao's essays which were most relevant to parts of Liu's lectures are not used by him two years after they allegedly were written.

4. On Contradiction was printed out of chronological order in Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Volume II, 10 April 1952. On the fly-leaf of this volume, the following statement is made by the Committee on Publication of Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Central Committee, CCP: "The essay On Contradiction published in this volume should have been in Volume I to accord with the author's chronology. It is included here temporarily awaiting republication of Volume I." This strongly suggests that On Contradiction was not available for publication even as late as 12 October 1951 when Volume I appeared in China.

5. On 1 March 1952, prior to the publication of On Contradiction, theorist Li Chi, writing in the theoretical journal of the party's Central Committee, Hsueh-hsi, denied that Mao was philosophically inept. Li attacked certain "infants" who believed that in the early period of the Chinese revolution, Mao "was not yet a well-versed Marxist-Leninist theorist." (57) Li called for criticism of this "entirely mistaken" view, suggesting that certain CCP members held it.

The publication of On Practice and On Contradiction "in 1937" was intended, Chinese theorists tell us, to combat dogmatists and the pretentiousness of their theories. Actually, the publication of these two essays in 1950 and 1952, respectively, was intended as the first major step in an effort to build the prestige of Mao as a philosopher. Soviet

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

leaders are undoubtedly aware of Mao's barrenness as a philosopher (as distinct from a revolutionary leader), but this is not the reason why Soviet praise for Mao as a philosophical genius gradually has subsided since 1950-1951. The Chinese claims, not the invalidity of the claims, disturb Moscow. Ironically, in December 1956, when the Yugoslav Communists were insisting on their "separate road to socialism," Khrushchev, speaking to a Chinese delegation headed by politburo member Peng Chen, contrasted the Chinese with the Yugoslavs. Whereas the Yugoslavs were "boasting," he said, the Chinese had many great achievements but "do not brag about them." He was, of course, aware that the Chinese were making claims for Communism in China which even then were tending to relocate the center of doctrinal originality in the Communist world.

NOTES

1. Chiang Wei-ching: "Study Mao Tse-tung's Ideology; Fully Develop the Motive Power of Self-Consciousness," Hung Chi, 16 January 1960.
2. Li Ta: "On Practice -- the Philosophical Foundation of Mao Tse-tung's ideology," in Selected Essays for the Study of "On Practice," Chung-nan Jen-min Chu-pan She, Hankow, December 1951, second edition, p. 72. (This article was originally printed on 1 February 1951 in Jen-min Jih-pao.)
3. Lenin: The Teachings of Karl Marx, International Publishers, New York, 1930, p. 14.
4. Lenin: Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, International Publishers, New York, 1927, p. 77.
5. Lenin: Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Moscow, 1952, p. 39.
6. Lenin: Philosophical Notebooks, Moscow, 1947, p. 156.
7. Lenin: ibid., p. 146
8. Lenin: ibid., p. 261.
9. Lenin: ibid., p. 174
10. Lenin: ibid., p. 157.
11. Mao Tse-tung: On Practice, English version, Peking, 1951, p. 5.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

12. Ai Ssu-chi: Ssu-hsiang Fang-fa Lun (On the Methodology of Thought), no place, Sheng-huo Shu-tien, 1936, 161 pp. Other early articles are on "philosophy for the masses."
13. Ai Ssu-chi: Mao Tse-tung Tung-chih Fa-chan-la Chen-li Lun (Comrade Mao Tse-tung Develops the Theory of Truth), in Selected Essays for the Study of "On Practice," op. cit., p. 56. (This article was originally printed on 2 March 1951 in Jen-min Jih-pao.)
14. Mao: op. cit., p. 21.
15. Lenin: Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Moscow, 1952, p. 122.
16. Ai Ssu-chi: Comrade Mao Tse-tung Develops the Theory of Truth, op. cit., p. 66.
17. Mao: op. cit., p. 20.
18. Maxim Gorky: Days with Lenin, New York, International Publishers, 1932, p. 45.
19. Lenin: Revolutionary Lessons, London, Modern Books, Ltd., 1929, p. 14. (Cf. also, On Dual Power and Letters on Tactics, Collected Works, Volume XX, Book I, pp. 115f., edited by Lenin Institute) Lenin's remark was made in 1917 and was intended to justify sharpening the revolution despite the orthodox theory's dictum that the bourgeois revolution must first be completed.
20. Marx: Theses on Feuerbach, II, in Ludwig Feuerbach, Engels, International Publishers, New York, 1941, p. 82.
21. Feng Yu-lan: "Mao Tse-tung's On Practice and Chinese Philosophy," People's China, Peking, 16 November 1951. Although Feng seems compelled to end his article by routinely saying that Mao "successfully solved a problem which has claimed the attention of so many brilliant minds through the centuries," what his argument actually reveals is that Mao's views were anticipated centuries before by these "brilliant minds." (Cf. Leo Strauss: Persecution and the Art of Writing. Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1952, p. 24. Professor Strauss argues convincingly that "persecution cannot prevent even public expression of the heterodox truth" by an intelligent writer such as Feng, one who has developed "a peculiar technique of writing...writing between the lines.")

22. Peking Jen-min Jih-pao, 9 April 1952. (cf also Shen Chih-yuan: "Mao-tun Lun" Chieh-shuo, (Explanation of "On Contradiction,") Wen-hui Pao, Shanghai, August 1952, sixth edition, p. 34. Mao "greatly deepened and developed the law of the unity of opposites.")
23. Ai Ssu-chi: "Comprehend and Use the Dialectic from the Aspect of On Contradiction," in Study On Contradiction. Hsin-chien-she Chu-pan She, Peking, 23 September 1952, first edition, p. 5.
24. Ai Ssu-chi: ibid., p. 7.
25. P. F. Yudin, for example, first cites Stalin's remarks on the agrarian movement in China and says that Stalin had "armed the Chinese Communists with a true understanding of the development of the agrarian movement." He then refers to Mao as having been directed by "Leninist-Stalinist theory" in his analysis of the revolution in China. Thus by careful arrangement of his material, Yudin seeks to show Mao's dependence on Stalin, but does not make it clear that the Stalin statement which he cites was made in April 1927, whereas Mao's analysis of the peasant movement appeared one month earlier, in March 1927. (P. F. Yudin: "First Volume of the Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Pravda, 26 August 1952).
26. Shen Chih-yuan, for example, first insists that in the 1924-1927 period, Lenin's and Stalin's works "had been disseminated in China only to a very small extent." He then says, "Yet Chairman Mao had already, in this very period, and even somewhat earlier, finished his Analysis of the Various Classes of Chinese Society (March 1926) and Report on an Investigation Into the Peasant Movement in Hunan

(March 1927)...exercising independent powers of reflection." (Shen Chih-yuan: Study the "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Volume I," Hsin-chien-she Chu-pan She, Peking, 20 January 1952, pp. 19, 25-26.)

27. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, in Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Volume II, International Publishers, New York, p. 15.
28. Lenin: Philosophical Notebooks, op. cit., p. 328.
29. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op.cit., p. 15.
30. Engels: Anti-Duhring, in Handbook of Marxism, Gollanz, London, 1936, pp. 256-7.
31. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op. cit., p. 42.
32. Lenin: Philosophical Notebooks, op. cit., pp. 192f. (Cf. Hegel's Absolute Idea in Logic.)
33. Ai Ssu-chi: op. cit., 25 September 1952, p. 26.

34. Theorists who had dutifully followed the party's "hard" line on the patriotic capitalists in writing for Hsueh-hsi were made scapegoats, as the line changed in April. In the 10 February 1952 issue of study, Yu Kuang-yuan and Hu Sheng had declared that the capitalists should be counterattacked, as they had launched a "ferocious attack" on the workers, and Ai Ssu-chi himself as late as 16 March had written in Hsueh-hsi on the "reactionary nature" of the capitalists. When therefore on 10 April the publication of Hsueh-hsi was suspended until June, the editorial board stated, "In several recent issues /i.e., spring 1952/, some articles on the question of the bourgeoisie made the mistake of one-sidedness, which is also related to the tendency of dogmatism... The republication of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's On Contradiction awakens us and makes us feel that we must adopt an extremely sober attitude and quickly correct these shortcomings and mistakes. The editorial board is now conducting a penetrating investigation and will inform our readers of the results." Scapegoats were also found in the party's Central Committee. In documents connected with his case, Hu Feng informs us that even Lu Ting-i, chief of the party's propaganda department, made a "self-criticism" in April 1952. During the shake-up period, apparently Chen Po-ta carried the burden of the propaganda department's work and, in a 13 May Jen-min Jih-pao article, he eulogizes Mao for his correct understanding of the "transformation" of contradictions.
35. On 21 April 1952 Jen-min Jih-pao made the revealing statement that now the "bourgeoisie will be afraid to break the law" and that the policy of the CCP is now "to unite with the bourgeoisie, not to liquidate its economy."
36. Lenin is more candid: "Of course, in politics, in which sometimes extremely complicated--national and international--relationships between classes and parties have to be dealt with...it would be absurd to concoct a recipe or general rule...that would serve in all cases. One must have the brains to analyze the situation in each separate case." (Left-Wing Communism, Ch. VIII)
37. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op. cit., p. 45.
38. Mao Tse-tung: ibid., p. 49.
39. Lenin: Philosophical Notebooks, op.cit., p. 328.

40. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op. cit., p. 49.
41. Ai Ssu-chi: op. cit., 25 September 1952, p. 27-28.
42. Ai Ssu-chi: ibid., p. 28.
43. Ai Ssu-chi: ibid., p. 29.
44. Bol'shevik, 1947, No. 16. (Or, A. A. Zhdanov: Essays on Literature, Music, and Philosophy, London, 1950, pp. 76-112.) The roots of Zhdanov's thesis may be found in Lenin's remark that, "Under socialism, antagonism disappears, but contradiction exists." (Critical notes on Bukharin's Economics of the Transitional Period, which Mao quotes.)
45. Shen Chih-yuan: "On Contradiction and the Science of Economics," in Study "On Contradiction", op. cit., pp. 73-96.
46. Li Ta: "On Contradiction -- the Guide to Revolutionary Action and Scientific Research," in Study "On Contradiction", Hsin-chien-she Chu-pan She, Peking, 25 April 1953, pp. 1-25.
47. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op. cit., p. 23.
48. Mao Tse-tung: ibid., p. 24.
49. Mao Tse-tung: ibid., p. 32.
50. Mao Tse-tung: ibid., p. 34.
51. Mao Tse-tung: ibid., p. 38.
52. Shen Chih-yuan: "On Contradiction and the Science of Economics," in op. cit., p. 88.
53. Mao Tse-tung: On Contradiction, op. cit., p.
54. Mao Tse-tung Hsuan-chi, Volume II; Chin-Cha-Chi Jih-pao She, May 1944, first edition, reprinted March 1945.
55. Mao Tse-tung Hsuan-chi, complete in one ts'e, Chin-Cha-Chi Jih-pao She, Branch Office, March 1947. Hsu-pien (Supplement to same), December 1947.
56. Cheng-feng Wen-hsien (Party Reform Documents), Yen-an, Chieh-fang She, 1944, first edition.
57. Li Chi: "Read Analysis of the Various Classes in Chinese Society," Peking, Hsueh-hsi, 1 March 1952.